

came over printed, of which blame was laid upon Ld. Nottingham, who was not in fault; and I had the trouble of seeing it come out, and the fears of displeasing my husband. But he was so kind as not to take it ill of me or not to love me less for that my great and endless misfortune.¹

•

These is no reason why Mary should have greatly repented her conduct to her father, granting her facts. He had endeavoured to overthrow a true religion in order to set up a false one, had palmed off a spurious heir upon the nation in order to defraud her of her rights, and had concerted the murder of her husband. To lose his throne was not too severe a penalty: the awkward thing was that she had taken it.

Nevertheless, Mary came to regard her quarrel with her sister Anne as a judgement on her for her treatment of her father. Macaulay treats their quarrel at considerable length, and allowing for a certain prejudice against Anne, his account is in the main correct.² But the authorities at his disposal were rather insufficient. Burnet deals somewhat briefly with the subject. He mentions it unwillingly, 'because it cannot be told without some reflections on the memory of the queen whom I always honoured, beyond all the persons I had ever known/ He thinks that after the breach in 1692 the Queen showed too much

resentment. ' The
matter went so far that the Queen ordered,
that no public
honours should be shewed the Princess
besides many other
lesser matters, which I unwillingly reflect on,
because I was
much troubled to see the Queen carry such a
matter so far/

Burnet tells us that the alienation of the two
sisters began
in the winter of 1689. The Princess ' thought
herself too
much neglected by the King', particularly
because she was

¹ Ibid. pp. 54-5-

² IV, 1816-20 (xv) ; V, 2124-30 (xviii).